

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Terry Edward McCall,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No.: 2:13-cv-00413-TLW
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
Sheriff Rick Clark, Director Drew Sisco,	)	
Doctor Hammond,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Terry Edward McCall (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action on February 15, 2013 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants, Sheriff Rick Clark, Director Drew Sisco, and Doctor Hammond (collectively “Defendants”). (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) issued on July 16, 2013 by United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks, to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). (Doc. #28). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. #23) and dismiss this case in its entirety for failure to prosecute. (See Docs. #23; 28). The plaintiff did not file objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. #28) was mailed to the Plaintiff on July 16, 2013 at the mailing address Plaintiff provided. (See Doc. #29). On July 26, 2013, the Report was returned as undeliverable and marked “No Longer Here.” (Doc. #30). The Plaintiff has made no further contact with the Court with regard to the above-captioned case.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and all of the relevant filings in this matter. After careful consideration, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. #28) be, and hereby is, **ACCEPTED**. Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. #23) be, and hereby is, **GRANTED**.

The above-captioned case is hereby **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with the Court's Orders, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962). It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend and Motion for Jail Inspection Order (Doc. #17) be, and hereby are, deemed **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

December 18, 2013  
Columbia, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within the time period set forth under Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.